

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during the interview held April 22, 2004, in the above-identified application. During the interview, Applicants' attorney explored with the Examiner various ways of demonstrating patentability herein. The discussion is moot, however, in view of the above-discussed amendment to the claims, and experimental data which Applicants intend to submit shortly.

The rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is now moot in view of the above-discussed amendment. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested it be withdrawn.

The objection of Claims 5, 6 and 9 is now moot in view of the above-discussed amendment. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that it be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. 5,720,780 (Liu et al).

Claims 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 5,922,493 (Humphrey et al) in view of JP 2000-235868 (JP '868).

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Humphrey et al in view of JP '868 further in view of U.S. 4,668,595 (Yoshino et al).

Claims 1-4 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Liu et al in view of Humphrey et al and JP '868.

Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Liu et al in view of Humphrey et al and JP '868 further in view of Yoshino et al.

Claims 7, 8 14 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshino et al in view of U.S. 6,106,973 (Sonozaki et al) and JP '868.

Claims 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshino et al in view of Humphrey et al and JP '868.


Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yoshino et al in view of Sonozaki et al and JP '868, and further in view of U.S. 5,244,757 (Takami et al) or U.S. 6,589,499 (Gao et al).

These rejections are traversed.

Applicants intend to shortly file a declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 and a substantive response to the prior art rejections of record, to the extent they apply to the above-amended claims. Accordingly, the RCE transmittal form **submitted herewith** includes a request for limited suspension of action for a period of up to three months, in accordance with 37 CFR 1.103(c). Applicants request that the suspension period end when the above-discussed declaration and substantive response are filed, if prior to three months from the filing of this amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Harris A. Pitlick
Registration No. 38,779

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
NFO/HAP/cja